arXiv:hep-ph/0204098v2 10 May 2002

GUT GENEALOGIES FOR SUSY SEESAW HIGGS [a]

C.S.AULAKH

Dept. of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh,INDIA, E-mail: aulakh@pu.ac.in

We discuss the embedding of R-Parity preserving Minimal Left Right Supersymmetric models into Pati-Salam and SO(10) GUTs.

Super-Kamiokande observations strongly suggest $|m_{\nu_\mu} - m_{\nu_\tau}| \sim .05eV$ and so, barring fine tunings, we expect $m_\nu < 10^{-1}eV$. Then if the neutrino is a Dirac particle (i.e ν_R is light) the relevant yukawa $y_{\nu_\tau} \leq 10^{-13}$. Else superheavy ν_R deouple from the low energy dynamics leaving a light majorana ν_L. Then the leading $(d = 5)$ operator for neutrino mass $((H^\dagger L)^2)$ occurs with coefficient M^{-1} with $M \geq 10^{15}GeV$. Within the seesaw scenario[1,2] $M_{\nu_R} \sim M$.

New Physics at large scales motivates Supersymmetry to maintain the structural stability of the theory against radiative disruption. $M_{\nu_R} \sim M_{GUT}$ raises hopes of a window into GUT physics via neutrino masses and vice versa[3]. Spontaneous, renormalizable M_{ν_R} implies a Higgs with $L = 2$ is needed. The ν_R field makes $B - L$ anomaly free and thus gaugeable. The MSSM loses the B,L symmetries of the SM due to the sfermions which allow B,L violating yukawas which imply catastrophic nucleon decay. Imposing matter parity $(P_M = (-)^{3(B-L)})$ or equivalently R parity $(R_p = P_M(-)^{2S})$[4] is the nearly unique[5] cure. It restores B,L at least at the renormalizable level. Protection against gravitational violation then strongly motivates gauging of $B - L$. If only $B - L$ even fields get vevs R_p is preserved. In fact one can prove[9,11]that Supersymmetric theories with a renormalizable seesaw mechanism imply that R_p will be exact in the effective MSSM (with neutrino masses) after heavy ν_Rs are integrated out : susy-seesaw based on B-L even vevs leaves the low energy theory with an Lepton number symmetry violated only by the neutrino mass operator. So sneutrino vevs lead to a unnaceptably light ($<< M_Z/2$) would be Majoron which is emphatically ruled out by the Z width.

Left-Right symmetric theories[6] with gauge group $G_{LR} \equiv SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ naturally gauge B-L[?]. Parity is only spontaneously broken. The Higgs doublets of the MSSM are in a $(1, 2, 2, 0)$ while the $U(1)_{B-L}$ breaking is via $\Delta = (1, 3, 1, 2), \overline{\Delta} = (1, 3, 1, -2), \Delta_c = (1, 1, 3, -2), \quad \overline{\Delta}_c = (1, 1, 3, 2)$. These pairings ensure anomaly cancellation and also permit susy preserving breaking to the SM gauge group.

Important variants contain a parity odd singlet(POS) field σ which couples to the Δ fields as $W = \sigma(\Delta\overline{\Delta} - \Delta_c\overline{\Delta}_c) + M\sigma^2$. Its vev introduces spectrum asymmetry and so also (via running of couplings) coupling asymmetry. The POS based LR Susy model initially introduced [7] broke charge[8] for generic high M_R . Minimal Left Right Symmetric models (MSLRMs) cure[9] this by introducing B-L neutral triplets $\Omega(1,3,1,0), \Omega_c(1,1,3,0)$ or using[10]. superpotentials $W = \Delta^4/M + ...$ The $< \Omega^c >$ breaks $SU(2)_R \rightarrow U(1)_R$ followed by $U(1)_R \times U(1)_{B-L} \rightarrow U(1)_Y$ breaking via the right handed Δ^cs. This permits a heirarchy $M_R >> M_{B-L} >> M_{B-L}^2/M_R >> M_W$, where the importance of the geometric scale is that entire left handed triplets have mass at that scale. The non-renormalizable case is even more dramatic. $< \Delta^c > \sim \sqrt{m_\Delta M} \sim M_R$ leads to masses $\sim M_R^2/M$ for the fields $(\delta_c^0 + \bar{\delta}_c^0), \delta_c^{++}, \bar{\delta}_c^{++}, \Delta, \overline{\Delta}, H', \overline{H}'$. Such light or intermediate mass scale multiplets are generic[12] and provide important constraints on LR models. *The low energy effective theory of such models is the MSSM with exact R-parity and seesaw neutrino masses* .

---

[a] Talk presented at SUSY01, Dubna, Russia , June 2001

How may we embed MSLRMs into SUSY GUTs so that they may inherit exact R-parity for the low energy theory even after $B-L$ is broken and neutrino masses arise ? An $SO(10)$ GUT based on the Higgs multiplets $45, 54, 126, \overline{126}$ which has MSSM with R-parity as its low energy limit was given[13] but the relationship between the MSLRMs introduced above (and their variants which include the POS) is quite rich..

MSLRMs embed easily in the Pati-Salam model with gauge group $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times SU(4)_C$. The fermions embed into $(2,1,4) \oplus (1,2,\bar{4})$ multiplets while the Δs with $B-L = \pm 2$ extend to SU(4) 10-plets. The breaking $SU(4) \rightarrow SU(3) \times U(1)_{B-L}$ is via $(1,1,15)$. Since the LR symmetry is external to the Gauge group the POS is an additional singlet (i.e not in (1,1,15) as in SO(10)) (see below). The basic MSLRM's (no POS) embed using $SU(4)$ singlet Ωs or else allowing $W \sim \Delta^4/M$. As before one gets intermediate mass multiplets in both cases . POS variants are also easy to write down.

Embedding MSLRMs in the SO(10) GUTs is more subtle. PS $(2,1,4) \oplus (1,2,\bar{4})$ matter fermions of each generation embed into 16 plets of SO(10), Δ, Δ^c pairs embed into $126, \overline{126}$. A renormalizable superpotential that breaks SO(10) to the Pati-Salam group and then to the LR symmetric group (Chain a)) or G_{214} (Chain b)) and finally to the MSSM via 126 vevs was constructed[13]. Chain a) proceeds via $< (1,1,15) > \subset 45$ and Chain b) via $< (1,3,1) >$. LR symmetry embeds in SO(10) as $D_{LR} \sim \sigma_{23}\sigma_{67}$. Then $< (1,1,1,0) > \subset < (1,1,15) >$ is Parity **odd** and so the theory below the PS breaking scale is *not* left-right symmetric though G_{LR} is . The light Higgs below M_{PS} descend from decuplets or (1,1,15) and include no Ωs but have POS (1,1,1,0) and a colored companion (1,1,8,0). This case thus has non-renormalizable terms (induced by integrating out the heavy superfields) and a POS i.e it embeds the

POS variant of the second MSLRM. One loop RG anaysis of gauge running shows $M_{PS}, M_R, M_{B-L} \sim 10^{-1} M_X$ which is *lowered* with them and hence the $d = 6$ contribution to nucleon decay re-emerges even in the SUSY case. Typically $M_R, M_C, M_{B-L} \sim 10^{13.5} - 10^{14.5} GeV$ while $M_X \geq 10^{15.5} GeV$ (from requirements of nucleon stability).

Chain b) utilizes the $\Omega^c(1,3,1) \in 45$ to break $SU(2)_R \to U(1)_R$. It embeds the PS version of the model with Ωs into SO(10). Thus the POS and Ω variants are mutually exclusive in GUTs based on the 45 of SO(10).

To decouple parity and $SU(4)$ breaking needs SO(10) models based upon[14] 210 which has a parity odd (1,1,1) submultiplet and a Parity *even* (1,1,1,0) multiplet. The parity even $(1,1,1,0) \subset (1,1,15) \quad \subset 210$ will break to G_{LR} group maintaining D_{LR} symmetry while the parity odd $< (1,1,1) >$ violates D_{LR}.

As in MSLRM's with higher dimensional terms , one may also construct models based on the 45 and 126 alone (i.e no 54) using $d > 4$ terms, details will appear.

To conclude : MSLRMs with exact R_P embed non trivially into various SO(10) and PS GUTs if the POS models are kept in mind. The one loop RG analysis of the gauge couplings shows that the the intermediate scales lie close to the unification scale so that a kind of "SU(5) conspiracy" holds. This is due to the fact that violations of the survival principle in SUSY GUTs keep certain colored and charged multiplets lighter than one would expect and their contributions significantly constrain the possibility of intermediate scales.

Acknowledgments This talk is largely a report of work done in collaboration with B.Bajc, A.Melfo, A.Rasin and G.Senjanovic.

References

1. M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, in *Supergravity*, eds. P. van Niewenhuizen and D.Z. Freedman (North Holland 1979); T. Yanagida, in Proceedings of *Workshop on Unified Theory and Baryon number in the Universe*, eds. O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (KEK 1979); R.N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanović, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).
2. R.N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanović, Phys. Rev. **D23**,165 (1981); M. Magg and Ch. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. **B94** 61, (1980).
3. K.S. Babu , Jogesh C. Pati , Frank Wilczek, Nucl.Phys. B566 (2000) 33-91.
4. R.N. Mohapatra, Phys. rev. **D34**, 3457(1986); A.Font, L. Ibanez and F. Quevedo, Phys. Lett. **B228**, 79 (1989).
5. L.E,Ibanez and G.G.Ross, Nucl. Phys. **B368**(1992)3.
6. J.C. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. **D10**,275 (1974);
R.N. Mohapatra and J.C. Pati, Phys. Rev. **D11**, 566, 2558 (1975);

G.Senjanovic and R.N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. **D12**, 1502 (1975).

7. M. Cvetič, Phys. Lett. **164B**, 55 (1985).
8. R. Kuchimanchi and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 4352 (1993), hep-ph/9306290, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3989 (1995), hep-ph/9509256.
9. Charanjit S. Aulakh, Karim Benakli, Goran Senjanovic, Phys.Rev.Lett.**79**, 2188, 1997, hep-ph 9703434.
10. C.S. Aulakh, A. Melfo, A. Rašin and G. Senjanović, Phys. Rev **D58**, 115007 (1998), hep-ph/9712551.
11. C.S. Aulakh, A. Melfo, A. Rašin and G. Senjanović, Phys. Lett. **B459**, 557 (1999).
12. C.S. Aulakh, B. Bajc, A. Melfo, A. Rašin and G. Senjanović, Phys. Lett. **B460**, 325 (1999), hep-ph/9904352.
13. C.S. Aulakh, B. Bajc, A. Melfo, A. Rašin and G. Senjanović, Nucl. Phys. **B597**, 89 (2001), hep-ph/0004031.
14. C.S. Aulakh, R.N. Mohapatra, Phys.Rev.D28:217,1983.